

M2492  
Wednesday November 13, 1974  
Barn  
Seminar Series, tape 2 of 8

Mr. Nyland: So I think this meeting—it's the second—will be a little different from last week. Last week I consider simply a little introduction, almost to know approximately what we are going to talk about. I think this meeting, you should also try to speak a little bit. Not necessarily that I expect you to hold a long lecture on your questions ... and it is a matter of exchange in which you should feel at home; and maybe I was a little autocratic or dictatorial or authority, and things of that kind, which I don't want.

I remember well enough when I became acquainted with the ideas of Gurdjieff, and also how difficult it was really to come into the thinking process which belongs to a method for Objectivity. It was not easy. Because I had studied a great deal and had been interested—and also in many affairs of, you might say, in a 'spiritual' kind—and then all of a sudden getting these impressions; and sometimes one on top of the other without even having a chance to digest them very much, made it very difficult to come to a real insight of what was the meaning. And then after a meaning started to glow a little bit at one place or another, then there was still the question of combining—to see how they were related with each other—and that they finally could find a place 'within' oneself, you might say, from where one then could start to operate.

I have really—I think I said that last week—a good hope for these kind of meetings. Because they will have to remain simple; and I have to remind myself not to become too theoretical, although every once in a while you have to admit that sometimes ideas, exactly because they are different—that is, different from our usual way of thinking—they have to be placed against the background of perspective. And it's particularly that perspective that may hold you back every once in a while ... because if you don't have already a little inclination towards perspectives, then it's very difficult to take a certain perspective of an idea for yourself.

Ideas like this have to be put into a soil which is partly prepared by yourself. I hope that it will help also other Groups. I think I've said that. My constant assumption is that you are reading All and Everything, and that you are honest and sincere and that your questions will tell. I will want to—and continue to—insist that there has to be a very definite sincerity regarding Work. And you have to be honest, also, about that. For instance, if certain things are said that really touch a different kind of aspect of yourself or sometimes even a new kind of world—as for instance when I talk more religiously in certain terminology with which you are maybe not familiar or where you may have prejudices—and of course it's obvious that you will have certain prejudices every once in a while when you have thought yourself, and you have become enamored with some kind of a theory which then, as a theory, is not placed properly in relation to that what is Gurdjieff, and then of course there is a little bit of difficulty on the part of yourself.

But when that happens, I hope that you become quite open about it. I remember once, many years ago, being objected to that I used the word 'God' too much. And this person happened to be religiously brought up—Christian in that sense—and based many of his ideas of Christianity on the Bible. And perhaps he was referring that you should not use the word 'God' in vain and therefore started, perhaps, accusing—or at least differing from me—in using the word 'God.' And to some extent I can agree with that; unless it becomes understood the way I mean it, and many times are when I want to use the word 'religion' it is not understood quite—when you think I talk about a dogma, or any kind of a doctrine or any kind of a religious system.

When I talk about religion, it means the application of that what is conduct for me in my ordinary life. And that doesn't mean that I bring the ideas of that what was then a religion down to Earth in any particular unbecoming way. I talk about what is this conduct of ourselves when it is not instigated and directed, and perhaps even corrected, by spiritual values. So about that you have to be quite honest. If it goes too far afield you can say so, and if you feel that it is not answering your particular purpose for coming to this Group, you also have to say it.

It's not so difficult for me to talk just about Work and the Work language, and to try to define concepts in the way I think they ought to be defined. I think in that sense it can be helpful for many people who already have been engaged in trying to apply Work in their daily life, perhaps even as a conduct. And it is also necessary that some of the moderators, or the different people who really may have lost a little bit of simplicity of an explanation of Work, would really listen to these tapes. I will recommend it to them tomorrow. Because I think it is quite necessary that all of us use as

much time as possible to really understand the quintessence of Work itself. And we start by definitions. I hope that they will do that. I hope also that sometimes questions which are asked in a larger Group and are not in my opinion answered correctly, that they would refer such a person to this Group; to sit and just listen and to be reminded, and then to know more, after they leave, in what way they were not clear about certain statements they made.

So I say, sincerity has to remain. I'm not checking up on you. I will know by the kind of questions you ask. For that reason I am sorry, the Group is already too large. I don't know if we should separate into smaller quanta. It does require more time; it also takes away a little bit of a coherence, of a unity among some of us who then start to learn to understand each other and that there is then less and less hesitancy in asking. But, we'll see for a little while how it works out. But you see, the quantity of people means that the possibility of asking diminishes a great deal.

Let me say something more about that before we open to your questions. A person has an attitude for this Work when he feels it can fulfill a certain emptiness in himself, which presupposes of course that he has been thoughtful and he has considered the meaning of his life. Not very much regarding his particular age and sometimes not even based on experiences; of course they do enter, but in general the interest has to be aroused because there are certain questions. Now, the questions about Work itself and the wish to find out what is meant by the definitions, has to be deep enough. So we cannot talk superficially; and it is not my particular aim to engage in that, so as soon as it comes to that, then I don't talk about it.

But therefore you must understand that the attitude of each person comes from a little different place, although it is similar in structure. When we say it comes an 'emptiness' within oneself, of course it has to do with a form of spiritual existence which has certain questions, and which questions then are not sufficiently answered and they start to bother a person. If they don't bother—they are very superficial—Gurdjieff has not lived for them. He only lives for those who want to continue to find out. To what extent it is possible for people living at the present time and in this, you might say, 'day and age' with the particular difficulties already existing in the world and the particular level of culture which we happen to have and which we call our 'education'; and whatever has been the particular background for us, I think these conditions of education have changed a great deal, and I don't want to assume that certain things exist which really cannot exist. Because you are not responsible for such influences on yourself, at the same time you know there is a difference between a person who wishes to create, like an artist, and another person who just

wishes to describe, like a scientist. It is of course the same thing if they continue to live their life and feel that that what they are pursuing is not answering to the questions which they have in reality, and a good scientist will have to come to that what is really within science as analysis; and that then the synthesis is necessary for himself to start to build up some kind of an image which belongs to the scientific endeavor. And it may take a form of some kind of philosophy where it is intellectually interested in that what is the meaning of things, and pure science, even if it is any kind of exact physical science or biology or any form of botany or zoology or astrology or astronomy or cosmology—things of that kind, even anthropology—all those things of course have a very definite meaning for each person who is interested. And when you become interested in psychology and you want then to find out why people are the way they are, your attitude of course becomes quite different from someone else who lives next door and is only interested in keeping his own garden.

I would say, you see, if you see this as a picture, there is a wide road which leads ultimately to Infinity. There are indications here and there, on that wide road which is traveled by people, that God is living at the end ... is at the end of a rainbow, and here and there are signs that this is a road which leads to that kind of entity. There are little houses along the road. It's a tremendously long road, and each house is connected, by its own little road, to the main road. That little road for each person is, of course, going through his garden—his own little pathway—and each morning when he wants to travel on the big road ... and he has to get out of the house and walk through his little 'pathway' I call it—his main highway for himself; whatever it may be; he may have an estate, he may have just a little shack—but when he finally comes to the road, much is really the same for everybody. Because on that road it is a question of an understanding of the totality of unconsciousness of each person who happens to live along that road—or anywhere on Earth, for that matter—and then his aim is really to 'undo,' as it were, his unconscious state and to substitute for it Consciousness and Conscientiousness.

So, in that respect the main road is made up of people who can understand their mutual purpose quite well, but when you leave your house you have a little struggle getting to the main road, even if it means only walking; and you have your own little bits of things like obstacles belonging to yourself and your household—to your family, to the way you are, to your personality—which may be to be overcome if you can, but in different times of the year ... and sometimes there is snow and you have to move it away, or you get stuck, or you have to have snow

tires, or your car doesn't want to start because it's too cold—you have little personal difficulties regarding getting to the main road.

That's what I mean: That when a person starts to become interested in Work, he has a different attitude from other people, and it's not so easy to understand the principle which is involved in all of it. And for that reason I say, don't 'get lost' in your little idiosyncrasies. That's all to the good, provided you continue to come to the main road. Then it is better. It does not mean it is clear sailing, but it's much better because you can understand, then, your companions a little better.

Then, of course on that road each person again will meet obstacles which belong to the structure of his personality. But for each person on the road it is an obstacle not defining the kind; because the obstacle is always connected with subjectivity, and on that road each person knows that he is subjective, each person knows that his aim is to become Objective. And therefore one can recognize, even, obstacles; you know characteristics of other people, you don't have to see them too close—or even to have them—to be able to understand what actually is the situation in which such a person is when he has a characteristic. You can understand, I think very well, a kleptomaniac. You can also understand a person who is too tall to go through a door .. and happens to be seven feet he has special difficulties, it's not so difficult to put yourself in his place. So there are, of course, such kind of conditions which, although they are a little different they don't amount to much because they *all* remain subjective. And as a general term, subjectivity is our ... I don't want to call it 'enemy,' but it is necessary to understand the strength of subjectivity when you want to do away with it, or understand it so that you can leave it. And the whole purpose of Work is to have an aim which will free you from the conditions of your own personality as it is. That is, if the body is similar to the Earth, you have to understand that the natural quality is really apparent in the way you are as an ordinary personality living and also in your own psychology, including your feeling and your thought.

I just want to mention that. Now, perhaps you have ideas about what you would like to know; and if so, go ahead but mention your name first.

So, tell me. I gave you a task, you remember.

Amanda Loza: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yea.

Amanda: Amanda Loza?

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Amanda: And you gave me a task to...

Mr. Nyland: Wait a minute. You were not here last week.

Amanda: No.

Mr. Nyland: My advice to you is to listen to the preceding week. That is true for each person who is new today: They should get hold of the first meeting and become conversant with it. That is why ... of course you don't know what I said then; and it's quite possible I gave you a separate task, if it is a separate task which no one of this Group really knows about, this is not the place to talk about it.

So, can we let it go? You can call me about it if you want to.

Amanda: I'll write to you, I guess.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, you see, because it is not in the sense that I would like a description of a task. The task refers to an application. A task usually is given for being more alert to the fact that I have to become Aware. And here, in this Group, we don't talk about Awareness. We talk about alertness, about the ordinary conditions of ordinary life in which there are certain subjects that become of interest ... which ought to be settled because one has questions about them in their inner life.

All right. Let's leave it at that. All right?

Amanda: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Katha Maslow: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Katha: My name is Katha, Katha Maslow. I hope this question isn't too theoretical, but I've often wondered and am confused about the difference between, um, the laws of Karma and reincarnation ... and the life that somehow has, I think, my name on it that continues through many lifetimes, and that which I'm working to develop, which is a Kesdjanian body that has an Individuality that would be different.

Mr. Nyland: What is the particular problem.

Katha: Well, I don't know how they're different. I mean I ... it seems to be...

Mr. Nyland: No. The question is: How much do you know of one, and how much do you know of the other.

Katha: I don't know anything of any of them.

Mr. Nyland: Then it's very difficult, then for that reason, even to say there is a difference ... you wouldn't know what the difference is. Moreover, I don't think it matters. Also, this whole question of reincarnation has to be understood from a different kind of standpoint. Because if I say this is the life I live and it is with my name, and I can also say that during this lifetime I have a Karma which I must fulfill, then I say, "Well, maybe I don't succeed in this lifetime," and therefore I hope I may have another lifetime in which I can then attend to that what I cannot do at the present. But if I look backwards and say if I can exist 'again' in reincarnation, it is logical to assume that I was here already before. Because there is no reason to assume that I just happened to start with my life, particularly when at times I do remember that perhaps I may have lived here before—the moments of *Deja vu*, for instance, could indicate that.

But, you see, there is so very, very little we know about it, and many times we go by statements of other people who are supposed to be sensitive. Now, the question of sensitivity for anyone who feels my life—or anyone else's life—and comes for a session simply to tell what is what: I mentioned, I think last time, of being at the pyramids or somewhere, how do they know. Moreover, what is their interpretation. It would mean that they actually could be at the place—let's say Egypt—where I happened to be at that time, because otherwise they could not describe what I went through and what was my particular problem, even including a Karma I might have had.

And so, it has to remain a tremendous generality. Because these people profess that they do know and that they can help many people about a variety of different kinds of lives and knowing perhaps everything about everybody—which of course is not so—but even if they say it is so for me, what is the use for me. I receive information of that kind; and I say, "Well, maybe I was some kind of an engineer or a priest and then I was functioning in the pyramids of Luxor, and at that time I was this-and-that and there were also some friends who happen to be at the present time still my friends" ... and it is like meeting them now, very much the same as you go to the same high school and after a couple of years you find out that people are interested in the same kind of ideas as perhaps Gurdjieff. But, what is the value for me. If I actually analyze it, in the first place I wouldn't go by what someone else is telling me. Maybe I can believe it, but then I try to imagine how I would have been, and even if I succeed in seeing what I was then, I surely cannot relive it.

So my reincarnation of the past is of extremely little value to me; because I cannot do it again

and, moreover, that what I have lived through in the past is supposed to have a result in the present. Because at the present time I still have what we call a 'Karma'—that is, that what is given to me as a possibility for understanding my life and in overcoming certain difficulties which are put in the way for me to reach that kind of understanding. But that, in a general way, I can more or less place in whatever I am thinking and feeling, and I can also say that I will know more about such laws of my Karma when I grow up and if I do become a little bit more spiritual so that then I can understand such laws as to actually what they are.

Because here is the main difficulty: Whenever I consider any kind of existence which is not like this Earth at the present time which I *now* experience, I start to hallucinate and I start to interpret that what is previous incarnation—and the future *re*-incarnation—as something that has a definite value measuring it by the terminology with which I am now familiar at the present time, and I cannot really say how I will be when that what takes place is subject to different kind of laws. Because if there is actually a reincarnation, there will be a period after I die that that what I am spiritually—because it has to be, since it has no body spiritually existing as an entity—is either sent, or commanded, or made desirous of wishing, to return to this Earth, and at that time there will have to be given some reason why this spiritual law should apply to me. And even when I keep on thinking about that what I then at that time will receive and then will have to enter into a new reincarnation, I have no means of finding out—now—what actually is the reason, because I don't live there as yet, and I don't function in any spiritual sense.

The main thing is, I believe, to leave it alone a little; to simply say, "Undoubtedly there are certain laws"—I can call them 'Karma'—"I also believe that what I don't do now I may have to do it also," but I don't know how I will have to face that what I *don't* do now after I may have had an opportunity of taking care of it in a spiritual life. And that therefore I can assume that at the moment when I leave this Earth and my body is no encumbrance any longer and I wake up out of the little period of sleep of forty days—in accordance with our measurement—and then enter into a different kind of an atmosphere of a spiritual world in which there are not the sense organs I am familiar with—and in which the communication is quite definitely different from the way it is now, and where there is no bondage of a human body—that then at that time I will have an insight in that what has happened to me up to the time that I leave this Earth this last time—let's say at my death which I now, I would say, 'approach'—and it is then, I hope, to be given to me as an explanation of the reason why I happen to be *now* on this Earth, what was the result of my attempts

at the present time, and what then is still to be done as an instruction which I hope I will receive.

And that, I think, is a much more satisfying viewpoint. Because it means that I'm perfectly willing to understand what is happening, and also that I don't doubt for a moment that I want to submit to any kind of a law which then happens to govern me; and, to my limited knowledge I simply assume that that what I am as an entity of a spiritual kind of quality, I 'hope'—I say sometimes—that it still will have my name and that it represents life for which I am responsible. So, in order to prepare for such actual occurrence—I say not 'eventuality,' because it's that what is going to be an experience and without any further question—that then when that happens, that I try to prepare for that as well as I can by attending *now* what actually is now given, and my understanding which I want to reach in order to understand that what I am now experiencing.

You see what I mean. That's all that God can ask. He cannot ask the impossible. I may be interested in fantasizing a little bit and talk about all kind of different realities, and for me they have absolutely no meaning. Because my imagination is not a reality ... and there's only one way by which an imagination can be made into an actual reality, and I've explained that the other day: As a result of an activity on the part of an 'I' which is first starting as an almost *fata morgana*; something that is of a spiritual value not as yet existing and not as yet acknowledged as an entity, that then when it starts to function it uses the materiality of myself, which is my reality *now*, for the purpose of creating a different kind of reality, which then is taken out of imagination and it can start to function in my life.

That is why Gurdjieff is way-and-way ahead of anyone who wants to talk all the time about spiritual values and entities. There are people who are honest about that when they talk honestly about out-of-body experience, but I would not bother too much about it; because it is a very special kind of sensitivity that will allow a person to have such experiences, moreover I don't think they are of much value, than only to those who experience them. And there is still a great deal of possibility for each person becoming more and more sensitive to receive information by means of dreams; in which one does not have to leave the body but becomes sensitive to such influences which then can be communicated in that state of deep sleep within the physical body, but with a freedom from the physical body because that what is receptive to that is not, at such a time, bound to the ordinary bondage.

I hope you understand what I mean.

All right?

Katha: I do. Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. All right.

It's a little out of the genre of what we want to talk about, you see, because now I will ask *you* questions. Who can define an 'I' at the present time, if your father and mother would ask you what are you busy with, with that kind of Gurdjieff philosophy. Go ahead, and now tell. You understand why I ask. Because I want, from you, reactions. I'm not here to lecture. I want conversation. I want actuality of thought on the part of yourself. So, don't be bashful.

Yah, who is it.

Peter Luborsky: Peter Luborsky.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Peter: Um, I would say my ... an 'I' is the thing in me that wishes ... that wishes to exist and to grow.

Mr. Nyland: How do you make it. Is it there all the time?

Peter: You're not in contact with it, maybe.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Peter: You're not in contact with it.

Mr. Nyland: But, it is there?

Peter: It might be.

Mr. Nyland: That wouldn't be an answer. You know, if I say "Is Philadelphia there" and you say it 'might' be there, I'm not encouraged to go there.

Bruce Cohen: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: No. Wait a minute. You can come in, but let's wait a little bit—all right?—unless you want to argue with him.

Bruce: Well, I don't want to argue about it.

Mr. Nyland: No—exchange ideas.

Bruce: All right.

Mr. Nyland: All right?

Now, go ahead, Peter: How do you know that it might exist.

Peter: Because it's a thing that alters your life, um, occasionally reminds you that he ... it wants to exist and grow. It's a sort of sensor.

Mr. Nyland: Do you think that is true for everybody?

Peter: I don't know.

Mr. Nyland: But you say it is true for you?

Peter: I think so.

Mr. Nyland: Have you really any reason to assume that it is there without even you knowing it.

You see, I can have a secret in my life that nobody knows and also I myself don't know it because so far I haven't found the key to open the door; at the same time, there can be in me something that recognizes the existence of something which *is* there which could be of value, and even at times I may have an experience in which I think I have a key and I try it, and for one moment it opens the door and, by golly I actually see my secret. But you have to have some experience of that kind before you can have further belief in the existence of it, because if it does not appear in some way or other, it doesn't do you any good to assume that it exists.

You understand that, Peter.

Peter: I'm not sure.

Mr. Nyland: There's no use talking about God unless you have experience that He actually exists. You cannot be vague about it; because we are not that kind of people, and also we are not spiritually enough developed to be able to judge about something that is even spiritual. It's perfectly all right to say that perhaps it exists, but I have to have some idea why I believe that; and if I honestly have not enough grounds for such a thing, then I don't want to be stupid and keep on believing it. We say many times get your feet 'on the ground' first, when you want to Work.

So, now why do you think there is something like an 'I' exists. [pause]

You can't answer it, can you. Can you? Are you still there, Peter?

Peter: Yes. No, I can't.

Mr. Nyland: Huh? You cannot. Then say it, will you? We don't beat around the bush here. Please don't. Because it's no use having little riddles. It's either "Yes" or "No." I know what I am saying or I don't, you do the same. All right, so in the future you cannot say it anymore. This is now a requirement. You've got to get rid of that kind of concept, unless you can prove to me that you have a right to use such words. And if you cannot prove that—neither to me or to yourself—you cannot in all sincerity keep on using it.

You understand now what I mean?

Peter: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Okay.

Now, you had some question about that—or not.

Bruce: Um, no, it wasn't a question. I wanted to define, um, what I believe the method or the process of creating an 'I' is.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, good. Yes, good.

Bruce: Um, to begin to have an Objective faculty that will see me as I am without making any judgments—being Impartial—and taking place at a moment ... in a moment, and that this faculty when developed will be able to give me information about myself that can...

Mr. Nyland: Good, let's go... So far, all right. Now the question is, why do you want that information.

Bruce: I want that information because so far I've been able to see that there are so many things about me that I don't know; that I find myself reactive, pursuing various things and then turning around and seeing that that was another ... to use the term that Ouspensky uses, another "I" that was not capital "I" but one of the many little...

Mr. Nyland: Yah, but let's talk about it just from the standpoint of common sense. The "I's which are not capital "I's are just little facets of my personality—nothing special about that "I," "I," and so forth.

Bruce: But those...

Mr. Nyland: It has no value.

Bruce: That's what I'm saying. I'm blind to myself. I cannot see how I am.

Mr. Nyland: Are you really in that sense, I would almost say, 'dumb'?

Bruce: I don't mean it's dumb. I don't mean it in that sense.

Mr. Nyland: No. But you have a hell of a lot of knowledge about yourself.

Bruce: In one sense.

Mr. Nyland: There are many senses.

Bruce: There are many things in my life that have been a result of life experiences, of being able to understand that I react in one way in this situation, another way in that situation and so on, but those are the things that I can see ordinarily.

Mr. Nyland: Good.

Bruce: But there are other things.

Mr. Nyland: But, why don't you want to continue with that. Because it gives you experience...

Bruce: I've been ... that is, I feel that I do that all the time—to see how I am in a given situation.

Mr. Nyland: You think that will stop?

I'm now trying to find out what is your motivation. Do you actually want to get rid of such experiences, or short-cut them?

Bruce: No, I think that will go on for as long as I live.

Mr. Nyland: I think so. So, it is not the motivation. That's why I say: Why do you want to Work, or accumulate facts.

Bruce: Because at some point there has to be a more total picture of ... of me—this existence of myself, of this body and of this personality and of the totality of me that...

Mr. Nyland: I can agree with that, but then you have to describe what is that what you have in mind as a totality of yourself.

Bruce: I don't think that ... that I can describe that.

Mr. Nyland: Oh. No. Why not. Huh? You're a good human being, and you want to grow up and being—what.

Bruce: But there's ... but something's greater than that, in terms of an 'I' being able to see that...

Mr. Nyland: Now, wait a minute. An 'I'—would have to create it. You have to start out with something that is already there in embryo. An 'I' is not going to bring that. The fact that you wish to have an 'I', already indicates something else. Why do you want an 'I' to be there—that comes from a wish on the part of yourself. What is that wish. An 'I' is only a medium. You see, it's only a means to an end. The real motivation is within a person, and he must see that that what he is at the present time is not 'complete' if you want to use that terminology, but then you must understand what is my incompleteness.

Bruce: That's the purpose of 'I'. I believe that 'I'...

Mr. Nyland: No. No, it's not the purpose of 'I'. The 'I' will help you to complete yourself.

Bruce: That ... that's what I was trying to say—that 'I' will help me see by giving me that information of what my incompleteness is—but somehow in what I have been experiencing, that what I can see in an ordinary way I can see, but always there's what I cannot see in an ordinary way. And that try as I might, no matter what I do to try and see in an ordinary way, even when people around me reflect that to me in many different ways, or I identify with something someone says...

Mr. Nyland: Can't you start with that?

Bruce: Yah, but that seems to be something that I'm alert to a great deal, in that respect.

Mr. Nyland: But couldn't it give you that kind of knowledge about yourself? If ten people say the same thing, maybe you will believe them. I'm only saying that perhaps it is not necessary as yet to have an 'I'.

Okay, we continue on the second side. All right?

Bruce: Yah.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

side 2 Ed: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: Who will start first.

Bruce: Well, but my ... my need, or what I've come away with from attempts, is that there's always only what I *can* see.

Mr. Nyland: No, no. That is why I am afraid that you didn't make the right attempts. That is why I think it is very good for you to be here.

You're Sidney, aren't you?

Bruce: No, no.

Mr. Nyland: What are you.

Bruce: It's Bruce Cohen.

Mr. Nyland: Bruce Cohen. Yes, I've heard you a few times. You're not clear about Work, and I think it is partly because the motivation is not right. Because, you see, you criticize yourself and you keep on saying that you have shortcomings—which of course is true—and that you are not complete, that you don't have enough knowledge of yourself, that you really would want to have more. But you have to be much clearer about what you really aim at as a Man in the sense of Gurdjieff. Not as a Man happening to live on Earth, because that is a different kind of a problem. We talk about a spiritual development. We talk about a Harmonious Man. We talk about potentiality which is there to become actual. We talk about a balanced Man being poised, of being able to do whatever has to be done, and with an understanding of why he should actually fulfill that kind of a task.

So, you see, we don't stare ourselves blind on that what we are not as yet. That's all assumed—otherwise I wouldn't want to Work—but I don't want to say I want to Work in order to fill in what I think I ought to have in addition; because that what I believe, the addition is usually a negation of that what I now do and I don't like it.

You understand that.

Bruce: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You look for a freedom which is ... unfortunately you cannot start to define it, because whatever you think of yourself unconsciously will be tinted by the ideas of unconsciousness. So even if you say I would like to be a very nice man and everybody can admire me or at least respect me, and I want to be a good father of children and have a family—and all of that you can find out in ordinary life by just having experiences. But, you see, this is a question for your own privacy. It's a question of yourself. Not a question in the eyes of the world. It's a question of what you consider yourself to be, as what you are now in which you say I am 'blind,' I am 'asleep,' I am 'unconscious.'

That's the first realization: Without wanting to say or describe the states of my unconsciousness, the fact that I'm unconscious means I don't want to be unconscious—otherwise I wouldn't talk about it—so I say in a general way, of course I want to become 'Conscious.' And then I say: "How." Well, you're not going to describe how a Conscious Man is going to operate. And in that sense you're right that your 'I' will help you to tell that, but one of the first requirements of an 'I' when it starts to exist, is to accept yourself for whatever you are.

Bruce: Yah, that's difficult.

Mr. Nyland: You see, and that is exactly the problem.

Bruce: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: I say to myself, and I want to believe, that everybody who says the same thing is right saying you are 'mechanical.' And I say "Yes, I am mechanical," then I say "I'm mechanical only when I'm on the periphery and I'm just by chance saying this and that and so forth, it's quite mechanical." And I can say, "Oh, hello"—"Good morning" and so forth, you know—but you say to yourself "I'm not so mechanical when I'm really essential; because I'm a good person, and I feel for other people and then I'm not mechanical."

Well, the question of that essence comes in, the question of the mechanicality also referring not to just physical behavior but has to do also with behavior as prompted by a feeling or even an emotional state, or prompted by the way I happen to think. And I may still keep on thinking clichés and become very mechanical whenever I see someone, and immediately my mechanical reaction is such-and-such-and-such regarding such a person. Now, I don't get around it by simply saying "Wait 'till I'm a little bit more sensitive in an essential way, and then I'm less mechanical." I'm just as much mechanical, only it's a little different kind of a color.

The difficulty for the 'I', is actually to give you facts which you can use for getting over this mechanicality. And the assumption is my mechanicality is mechanical, but then Impartiality means I am mechanical, but I don't give a damn. It's an entirely different viewpoint. When I'm mechanical I'm identified, and all the time I will say I 'shouldn't' be and I strive towards being nice and so forth—and tolerant, and not fly off the handle, and not having reactions to my enemies the way I always have it. And I say I ought to be 'Impartial,' but Impartiality is not non-mechanicality. Impartiality means continuation of mechanicality, but the registration by my 'I' is not interested in the fact that this body, of myself as a personality, is mechanical. And that is the difference.

So, I don't start with that what I lack and what I still ought to acquire and the way I want to grow up. I start with what I am now, and I want to have this 'I' actually See, See in the sense of spiritual Being—that is, an Awareness which doesn't go through my eyes and in which there is no kind of association, no kind of description, no kind of any liking or disliking, no kind of description that I am mechanical, no kind of description that I am not as yet complete, no kind of descriptions. I have many habits which are no good and I really don't like—all such things are unconscious measurements. And of course it's obvious they must exist, because I happen to live on Earth and everybody knows it. And if I'm obnoxious and I say to myself "I'm obnoxious," I cannot hide behind the fact that someone says you are obnoxious. And I tell them, "Ah yes, but my 'I' [laughter] ... but if you only knew my 'I', you would know *me* better." [laughter]

You see the difference.

Bruce: Yes, I do.

Mr. Nyland: All right.

Bruce: Yea.

Mr. Nyland: Keep at that. 'I' means I want to see myself—I say it sometimes: *That I am*—without any possibility of describing me, without seeing *who* I am or even *what* I am. You see, I don't ... I'm not interested from the standpoint of 'I'. That would be complete acceptance to whatever I am is acceptable to this 'I'. Because this 'I' is functioning as an *Objective* faculty, and in Objectivity my subjectivity does not count. What does count is the reason of my subjectivity being expressed in the form, and that *cause* is my life. And I become Aware of my life ... and I Wake Up, with this 'I', to that what is my life, hoping that under the influence of this 'I' my life also will be Awake—that means, free from the form of subjectivity.

You understand now better?

Bruce: Yah. There's one question, that in something you just described ... that was raised in my mind, and that is that—and I've heard this before—that 'I' is in a sense Benevolent or ... but then that confuses me in terms of Impartiality, because in my mind I have the idea that Impartial has no connection to Benevolence or dislike, or anything else.

Mr. Nyland: You know, when there is a father who wants to spank his child and he really doesn't want to do it and then he slaps him and he says "It hurts me more than you," you know...

Bruce: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: ...that is still a case of Benevolence. Because he does it for the sake of telling the child, in some way or other, that what the child was doing was not right.

By Benevolence as far as the 'I' is concerned, is interest in me. That is the Benevolence; then when it wants, in this emotional sense, to be present to me, it will accept everything I do but only as a first step, and the Benevolence then will take on gradually a certain attitude of wishing to help more, but first by understanding of that what actually is the way it is. So that if afterwards this 'I' starts to tell me that you're not getting on your high horse, and start to explain it is not really the way the 'I' thinks it is, it is the way *you* see it—there's no contradiction in that. The act of Impartiality in itself, of course is like a cold fact. And sometimes one does say that: 'It leaves me cold,' or '*Cela, m'est égal*'—it is equal to me—but then almost immediately after that, the other side ... the other aspect of the 'I' comes forward and says, "But I love you and I wish you to grow up, so now I will help."

But first establish the fact that you are nothing. Only those who lose themselves will find themselves. And that's the only explanation from the Bible—that one can understand why I have to lose myself. I have to lose all kind of ideas about my own mechanicality and whatever I am as a unconscious person, and when I then try as a Man I'm absolutely nothing at all; without any pride, without any wish for self-aggrandizement, or any selfishness, conceit and so forth, then I will be in the right kind of a state of being a slug.

Bruce: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: All right?

Bruce: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. Good, Bruce.

Now, you wanted to say something. Yah.

Deborah Rubie: Deborah Rubie.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Deborah: Um, now I want to say something different than before.

Mr. Nyland: Will we wait a little bit? You might change it again. [laughter]

Deborah: Ah, I'm not sure. What you said to Bruce now confuses me; because, uh if I understand you correctly, what you said to him was that if he wishes to Work from the standpoint of having an 'I' because he wants truthful information about himself, or more complete—or, you know, how he described it—and you said "No, it has to be from a standpoint of," you know, "not thinking either in terms of good or bad"—right?—well, doesn't that mean that you have to start from a point of acceptance?

Mr. Nyland: That's right.

Deborah: Well, how can...

Mr. Nyland: And he still has to do that.

Deborah: See, I mean ... I don't...

Mr. Nyland: Or, did you think I told him to go ahead and do what he feels like?

Deborah: No, no. I mean of acceptance ... see...

Mr. Nyland: What is acceptance for you.

Deborah: Yah. Well, acceptance is something that I see as something that's not possible for me right now, and that I hope it will be a result of Work.

Mr. Nyland: That's good. Just keep on trying. It is all right. When one talks about acceptance and in the real sense of the word that acceptance has to be, as we sometimes say, 'hundred per cent,' it involves a great many things that are necessary to bring it up to that point in which acceptance is a real experience for oneself. And all during that period from the very beginning of the creation of an 'I', and an 'I' exercising its possibility of actually growing up and then becoming functioning regarding me—and as a matter of fact, starting as one or two cells which, at an early age of this 'I' starts to separate out, and one is of interest to my intellectual potentiality and the other becomes interested in my emotional one; in which the one goes over into an Awareness and the other goes over into the presence as a result of intuition, both indicated by a Benevolence on the part of this 'I' wishing to help because it was created for that purpose—it does not mean that that 'I' is already full-grown enough ... and therefore even Observations by this 'I' may be very small, in principle they will remain the same.

But I've said many times, Jesus Christ did not start teaching until he was thirty years old, and all during that period he was learning; and most likely he was with the Essenes, and only... I think there is one description in the Bible—where he came out of the desert and appears in the temple when he was twelve years old; and he started to teach, or at least give some answers, and then after that he disappeared again, simply because he did not as yet really feel he was sufficiently grown—regarding his own change of being an Individuality—that he could already afford to talk about Work, but he was still growing up.

So you have to look at it much more as a longer period, without having any thought that one can already be in the very beginning hundred percent accepting that what one is.

Does that clarify it.

Deborah: Uh...

Mr. Nyland: Don't be impatient.

Deborah: Yea, but ... uh, does that mean that it is wrong to have a wish from ... does it mean that it's not right that the reason that you Work is because, uh...

Mr. Nyland: No, I think it is right to have that wish as a stimulus, but the actual application cannot have that wish enter. The wish for Work is there because I have different motivations of seeing myself the way I am. That gives me energy, a very definite desire on my part to create an 'I' which then should start to function. That is as far as that kind of a wish can go. But then comes 'I', which is then functioning differently—that is actually Observing me and is accepting me *as I am*, *that I am the way I am* ... or even sometimes *how I am*.

So, you see, the 'I' is not doing the same as what *you* do when you have the original wish.

Deborah: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: Now, the difficulty is that while this 'I' is trying its best to be Objective, there is energy going into your *own* wish for wanting to grow up in a certain way which you determine, and the amount of energy that goes there will of course be taken away from the other amount of energy which should go for the formation of an 'I' and the maintenance of it. So, at most you can say your attempts for Work are not very efficient.

So I don't think it's bad, I think it becomes a little impossible. The more you are continuing with looking at yourself the way you are and really not liking it, even if you make an attempt to accept it you don't do it whole-heartedly because you really ... somehow or other you hope that you will be different if you Work. And you don't know anything about that kind of difference.

What you *do* know about the difference is, that you'll be free from that what now bothers you.

Keep on thinking a little bit about it. Because you must try not to mix it up. But that you do mix it up, I think is quite obvious: It happens with everybody.

All right?

Deborah: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Yea. So, more question about definitions of terminology.

Kathy Kane: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Kathy: This is Kathy Kane. Often you use the terms 'involution' and 'evolution,' and I'm not clear about exactly what you mean.

Mr. Nyland: Well, we use involution as a term for a certain current which, in accordance with description of how the world started to exist, emerged from a central point, and we call that the 'Sun Absolute.' And that the creation of the world was necessary for maintenance of the world itself as a universe—that is, not our world, although it includes our world. So that then this idea of what is really the reason for a universe existing, was the formation of different other forms of existences, a little bit further away every time from the Sun Absolute and a little bit more bound than on the Sun Absolute itself, and more and more subject to destruction in the sense of what we call 'time.'

Now, at certain points away from that Sun Absolute and looking at it from the standpoint of a universal existence, there were different places on each one of these, what we call, 'Rays of Creation.' A Ray of Creation, using the same kind of explanation, can come from one point extending into all directions of the universe as a whole. It's a question that is rather difficult to understand when you see that what is as universe, at the same time you say it is 'eternal' or it is 'Infinity.' So that when you wish to explain the creation of the universe in the different aspects of the universe and then link it up with stars and solar systems ... and Milky Ways and finally come down to that what is the Earth, you have to go through a lot of imagining of why actually that is taking place; and that then you must come to the conclusion that that what we are on, if that is only one Ray of Creation happens to be this particular one in which this particular Earth happens to be and in which we, as humanity, happen to live. So it is really one out of ten thousand millions that we say this Ray of Creation is the one that belongs to us, but there are so many others that really

they are in the same kind of condition, only we don't know about it.

This particular current that is set up as an expanding of life from the Sun Absolute, we call an 'involutionary' law. That is, that law has a result in the formation of different crystallizations on the way of this Ray of Creation existing at certain times, crystallizing out and then continuing again and a little further, as it were, again crystallizing out and then again starting on its pursuance of that same direction.

I don't entirely agree with it, because I think it is an explanation that belongs to one's ordinary life—that is, the life we know it in our limitations of thought—and particularly when we say the Ray of Creation is in accordance with a tonal scale and that we say it is in accordance with the Heptaparaparshinokh, and that where it starts from is the 'Si-Do' and the Ray of Creation goes down from 'Si-Do' to 'La,' to 'Sol,' to 'Fa,' to 'Mi,' to 'Re,' and to 'Do, and then assuming that at 'Do' there is still enough life left for the continuation of this involutionary law and then we say "now that's where Anulios is." I say it is a little bit 'wrong' to assume that in accordance with the laws of the universe we have ... are still dependent on the Law of Seven; but aside from that, we already know that whenever you look at the Ray of Creation and you say "Well, in reality it is not like that but there is also in the Law of Seven the Law of Three and then saying that the Ray of Creation is made up of 'Do' and 'Fa' and 'Si-Do,'" well, it is all right and it's a very nice puzzle, but it doesn't help much.

That we call 'involution.' It is a current to which every person now living, every crystallization now existing, every form of life having been crystallized out into any kind of form is subject. And that therefore when nothing is happening to any one of them, any form of energy represented by the crystallization only, will finally end up in the Anulios as the growing end of the involutionary law. This applies to every point of the universe, and it applies also to the Earth and where Mankind happens to be and where each Man has the same kind of difficulty of trying to Wake Up and becoming Conscious. That is, he starts to realize that he is in this current of involution, and somehow or other something in him tells him it is not the right way to be when you wish to keep on being in contact with eternity.

You see, the whole Ray of Creation is away from Infinity and eternity, and so there is awakened in a person a desire to go, as it were, 'contrary' to the involutionary law. That he calls for himself 'evolution, and he hopes that by means of that he can counteract the influences of crystallization from the involution, and de-crystallize himself in the sense of evolution. And in

that sense, then, he will be able to understand more the realm of the universe as a 'whole,' as it were, by climbing up this particular ladder as indicated by the Ray of Creation and going from the place where he is now, which on that Ray happens to be 'Fa' mostly—or at 'Mi'—and then going over to 'Sol,' 'La' and 'Si-Do,' finally reaching the Sun Absolute.

Now, whatever the theories are that are connected with it, the main thing for Man on Earth is to be interested in finding out how can he counteract involutionary law which is his unconscious state, and in counteracting it undoing the influence of that unconsciousness by substituting that what is his Conscious life. He is at the present time at 'Mi' of that scale. The 'Fa' of that scale is his particular possibility of feeling and emotions. The 'Sol' of that scale, for him individually, is that he has a brain which could become Conscious. And that the evolutionary step to be taken by a Man is the realization of what he is now: Unconscious at 'Mi'; wishing to have, as a result of this 'Fa' existing, a very definite desire to reach a state of Consciousness. And that is then, you might say the 'progress' of a Man which then counteracts or balances the involutionary law, and in being in an evolutionary sense attached and wishing to continue with it, he then denies the influence of the unconsciousness, the influence of the involution, and in that sense a Man becomes free from both.

Does that answer you a little?

Kathy: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: All right. It's good to think about it, but don't think too much about it.

Kathy: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: Much of this is fantasy. It is interesting because it gives, sometimes, perspectives. Many times when you look at the sky you are actually in awe to see if such things are all subject to Rays of Creation, and why they are the way they are in accordance with certain laws which apparently are very definite and which are adhered to. Then one can start to think about a Conscious kind of intellect becoming responsible for the totality of all existences of the universe, and I think it is a very interesting subject to consider and to ponder about.

All right?

Joe Grosch: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Joe: Joe Grosch.

Mr. Nyland: Joe who?

Joe: Grosch.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, Joe.

Joe: I've had this question for some time—over a year, I believe—and I don't know if it really fits, but I'll ask. To say that ... I wondered if trying to strive to bring a quality, to increase the quality of what I do in ordinary life—for instance my job, just what I do as a job, trying to do it better whenever I can and trying to bring more quality to what I do ordinarily—if that would also bring quality to those periods when I try to Work on myself. Or, is it something I shouldn't consider.

Mr. Nyland: No, no. No, no. It has a perfectly good reason to exist, and there is a very definite influence. There are three results of these kind of attempts—that you want to do something well. The first result, obviously, is for the unconscious existence of yourself on Earth—that that what is a good product actually you can be proud of, and also it can be admired by other people. It's a very good result. The second reason is that when I do this and I do this in my ordinary work, I already learn, because of the wish to put all things together of the three centers of myself, that what sometimes might object to that, and I learn to make them—all three—work for a common aim. All of that is still unconscious, but it gives a certain indication to myself what is meant by discipline, what is meant by authority, what is meant by the possibility of one or the other or the third being more advanced than the other two and then taking the upper hand and giving that as a responsibility which is required in order to do the job right. So, it has a good result like that for me in an unconscious sense.

Now, that what actually is the real reason for doing it, is that in this particular process I learn to understand tendencies on the part of any one of my three centers; and I say they may still be unconscious, but there will be a time they will be Conscious—every one of the three—and I would like, in that unconscious state, to have a Conscience which will allow the three of them, as it were, to 'live together' in unity. So the aim is then to reach a certain state for the three of them; and this time hoping that in a full grown condition they are represented more by the actual bodies and not any longer by just a couple of centers, that then in that state there is a possibility of reaching a form of unity which I cannot have now.

If there is a Consciousness and a Conscience and if they learn how to work together, it's quite a different state from what I am at the present time. Because very seldom that I really agree with that what I feel intellectually, and although I do it every once in a while and I make an attempt, it does not come natural. And I doubt very much if it ever will become natural, but it can become

Great Natural—in accordance with spiritual laws which then start to govern that what is a full grown Consciousness in the form of a Soul, and a full grown Kesdjanian in the form of that what is now an emotional attempt—and that then my physical body will take on the proper place in relation to those other two and will become a servant to execute the Will of the other two, which are united in one endeavor: For the benefit of the totality of myself as a real Man.

So, you see, it has an enormous advantage, but as soon as I start to think about it in my ordinary, daily life and I start to fantasy that now already I should have a full grown emotional and a full grown intellectual body, of course I'm completely off. So, don't start mixing it. What you ask me if it had any reason I say "Yes, definitely," but when you're busy with your ordinary work continue doing it as well as you can. Every once in a while looking back on it, you will see that you have acquired dexterity and that kind of dexterity will serve you, will be used in good stead later on in many attempts you have to make regarding Work on yourself. Because many times later on when one actually starts to find out what one is, in that kind of reality of the acceptance is sometimes very difficult to take; because there are the tendencies which have to be accepted, there is very definitely a wish and there is still something of the mind which tries to get away with it without having to do real Work. And therefore, for the real formation of a Soul it is necessary to be able to get free from all such considerations, and I learn to get rid of them—or at least to be freer from them—already when I am 'young,' as it were, in unconsciousness.

You see that, Joe.

Joe: Yes. It's just a question of balance, how the particular...

Mr. Nyland: How does it enter, you see. That's why I say "Concentrate on your daily work." Whatever you are doing, do it well. That's it. The results of that will be noticed afterwards. Don't look for them now, because you will start mixing it up. I say 'don't mix' it. I'm giving you the three results as they will take place, but not as a result of all of the three existing at the time. They don't. The concentration of the three centers, of wanting to do a job well, requires so much energy that there is no possibility, really, at any one time ... to have an independent 'I' actually Observing all the different movements of yourself, and even being present to that? The whole idea of working together with three centers is somehow or other united and that at the end of it, when you've done it you are happy? And you're identified. You remain identified with it. That's why I say don't mix it up, at the same time it can have a very good influence—ultimately.

Joe: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Okay?

Joe: Okay.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. You see, I Work after I have settled all the theoretical questions of why I should Work, and then I Work without really paying any attention to what I want to accomplish, than only I want to be Awake. And the sole question of my wishing to be Awake is concentrated in the formation of 'I' existing then, and becoming for me a guide. But I don't want to define that any further. Because it is like talking to people who are saying what Heaven looks like. It's idiotic, and why should I want to know it—I'm not living there. And to try to create it in a way as if it is Heaven is also idiotic; as soon as I am in the street and someone steps on my toe, I certainly am not in Heaven. [chuckle]

Now, questions. Come on. We are getting to the end—aren't we, almost?

Steve: About, um, six or seven minutes left.

Mr. Nyland: All right. More of an exchange. Really, you have to learn.

Yah.

Jim Thomas: It's Jim Thomas.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, Jim.

Jim: When you were talking to Bruce you said that 'I' should be Objective and that ... so it wouldn't describe, and for example it wouldn't call oneself 'obnoxious.' Um, can't ... couldn't it call itself obnoxious but still be Objective?

Mr. Nyland: Well, I don't know what you understand by obnoxiousness.

Jim: Well, anything.

Mr. Nyland: I'm quite certain when I consider someone obnoxious, I dislike him. I don't think that that can be justified. If I could actually be free from whatever is meant by obnoxiousness, it wouldn't bother me at all, and I wouldn't even call it 'obnoxious.' The fact that I call it that way means something else is involved with my ordinary unconsciousness. I have a measure with which I start to measure the behavior of someone else, and in some way or other I don't think it's to my liking, or in some other way it may not be in accordance with the law. But the freedom that we talk about has really to do with a total acceptance of that what I am as life, without expressing that life in any form—or if it is expressed, I call it simply 'transparent' as form. But you see...

Jim: I see, you mean pure acceptance.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. I only talk only about pure acceptance. That is that what is at the end. On the

road towards it, of course I have difficulty of accepting obnoxiousness on the part of myself; because other people don't and I will justify it all I can, and so I keep on shifting all the time regarding that what other people tell me about myself, and I include many times what I think of other people. And, why shouldn't I. Because that's the way we are brought up on this Earth. I don't think it does any particular harm, only the harm is it keeps me asleep.

But go ahead if you want to feel obnoxious about yourself; and it's interesting and all of that, go ahead and express it, see how far you get.

Jim: No, I didn't mean to express it. I meant just that I felt one could see it but still be Objective.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, when you see it and you recognize it, it's already defined, isn't it.

Jim: Yah.

Mr. Nyland: As soon as you have a name that is indicative of that 'what is' so-called, it's already classified.

Jim: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: All right.

More questions—that what gives rise to you, what can you think about this coming week. I would like: As many as you can, attend to the listening. I mean that both Groups go together, and you have to make some time. Because if you don't, you just get away with certain things because you are lazy. Try to consider this period as an extremely important one. Because after a little while it stops, I won't give it anymore, and I don't know where the hell you will get it. So, either you value it and you do as I ask you to do for your own benefit... And, don't quibble about it. Because that is what I am telling you. Last time there were just about eighteen; it's not right, there were here—I don't know—thirty-five last time on the Wednesday. Either we make this a good Group and you work together for a certain length of time concentratedly, with sincerity, with real ambition, with really wanting to find out what is this Work, what does Gurdjieff mean, after you have done it you can make up your mind. You can say it's not for me and then you can leave. But if you want to Work, you've got to go through that. It is a school, a little bit of that kind of something preparatory to that what you can call a high school, when you actually learn how to Work and what to do about it.

So, please understand it. That's the way I look at it, that's the way I hope you will understand it: as I understand it, and that you will act in accordance with it. These two meetings for all of you are very important. If they are not important enough for you, they certainly will never be

important for me. And if there is not enough of that kind of importance attached to it, then my interest is very, very little.

Please understand it. I'm not preaching. I'm just telling you a little bit of what I think that a human being wanting to grow up and wanting to understand life as it is, with all the difficulties which are now presented to you in all kind of forms of economics and politics and all the rest—of slavery and killing and hypocrisy which exist, and all the goddamned nonsense that takes place. What are you going to do within yourself to keep your balance, to see that you still can grow up and not be taken away by such currents which, in accordance with Gurdjieff, will lead to the nether regions and in that you will, like the Bible says, lose yourself completely and there will be gnashing of teeth. Don't stay unconscious. You don't have to. Work for a living of your inner life.

And that's it, yes?

Steve: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Goodnight, everybody. Come again; next time 5:30, it was only special for this time at 5:00. Good night, have a good week.

End of tape